

REMARKS

Claims 34-59 were presented in a Preliminary Amendment filed with a Request for Reexamination filed on April 17, 2006. Claims 34-59 were rejected in the current Office Action.

Claims 35-46 and 48-59 have been cancelled and new claims 60-69 have been submitted in this Response. Dependent claims 60-64 are dependent on independent base claim 34. Dependent claims 65-69 are dependent on independent base claim 47.

Independent claim 34 and 47 were rejected in the current Office action as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,835,726 to Shwed et al. (hereinafter “Shwed”).

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to thank Examiner for the courtesies extended during a personal interview with Applicants’ Representative and Attorney for Applicants on October 12, 2006. During that interview Applicants’ Representative and Attorney for Applicants discussed proposed amendments to the claims and discussed possible limitations to distinguish Applicants’ invention over the art of record. Specifically, the layering and combination of processing elements of the service control center recited in independent claims 34 and 47 was discussed as being novel over the Shwed reference.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS

Independent claim 34 has been amended to recite a plurality of logic elements that are operable to deploy a service definition package to a plurality of network processors. Specifically, independent claim 34, as amended, recites logic elements that are operable to select one or more network processors for implementing the service definition package, to provide processor-specific instructions and data to perform packet processing behaviors, and to load to instructions and data into the network processors. Claim 34 further recites logic elements that are operable monitor one or more network processors and to report status information regarding the service definition package. Independent claim 47, as amended, provides a method reciting

method steps containing similar limitations to those recited in independent claim 34. Support for the limitations recited in independent claims 34 and 47 can be found in Figure 4 of the specification and on page 20 of the specification.

Applicants submit that the combination of limitations recited in independent claims 34 and 47 is not shown in Shwed, nor elsewhere in the art of record. Applicants, therefore, submit that the rejection of independent claims 34 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 60-69 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
November 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,834